

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

## A Rational Reply to the False Claims of Amjad Rafeeq

بَلْ نَقْذِفُ بِالْحَقِّ عَلَى الْبَاطِلِ فَيَدْمَغُهُ فَإِذَا هُوَ زَاهِقٌ وَلَكُمُ الْوَيْلُ مِمَّا تَصِفُونَ ﴿٢١﴾

*“Nay, We bring the truth against the falsehood, so it destroys it, and behold, it (falsehood) is vanished. And woe to you for that (lie) which you ascribe” (21:18)*

Amjad wrote:

‘...In the question in Arabic, the questioner informed the Shaykh in the speech of Ibn Hajar there is (وَأَنَّ الْعَمَلَ شَرْطُ كَمَالٍ). This is incorrect, Ibn Hajar did not say that, he used the word (الأعمال). This is purely from the point of being accurate in words and not misrepresenting or misquoting anybody...’

Let’s see if the term (العمل) was used in describing the speech of Ibn Hajar in the question which was posed to al-Allaamah, Ibn Baaz, may Allah have mercy upon him:

-المشكاة: ذكر الحافظ ابن حجر في الفتح عندما تكلم على مسألة الإيمان والعمل، وهل هو داخل في المسمى ، ذكر أنه شرط كمال ، قال الحافظ : (والمعتزلة قالوا : هو العمل والنطق والاعتقاد ، والفارق بينهم وبين السلف أنهم جعلوا الأعمال شرطاً في صحته والسلف جعلوها شرطاً في كماله).

Questioner: Al Haafidh Ibn Hajar mentioned in *Fath Ul-Bari* when he spoke about the matter of eeman and (العمل) the actions, and if it enters into its (i.e. eeman) meaning, and he mentioned that it (I.e. العمل) is a condition of completeness...”

Whilst Ash-Shaykh Ibn Baaz acknowledged the questioner in using the term (العمل) al’amal when describing the speech of Ibn Hajar.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/feebleresponsetoamjad.pdf>



Also Ash-Shaykh Saalih al-Aali-Shaykh, may Allah preserve him, said when criticizing the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar which Amjad propagated:

“...There is no difference between Ahlus-Sunnah and al-Mu'tazilah (from this angle), Ahlus-Sunnah do not see (العمل) the actions to be a condition; rather they see it to be a pillar because what is entered to the fold of eeman is a pillar.<sup>2</sup>”

So as you can see the Shaykh used the term (العمل) in relation to the speech of Ibn Hajar.

Also Muhammad Ishaq al-Kandu used the term (العمل) when describing the speech of Ibn Hajar in his thesis regarding the belief of Ibn Hajar.

So are all of the aforementioned likewise accused to be inaccurate in their wordings!

Also Ash-Shaykh al-Baraak said when criticizing the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar which Amjad propagated:

“His (i.e. Ibn Hajar) statement ‘*the difference between them (the Mu'tazilah) and the Salaf...*’<sup>3</sup> This difference between the Mu'tazilah and the Salaf is not correct whether it was intended by the term ‘condition of correctness’ or by the term ‘condition of completeness’ the actions in general or either the types of actions which are obligatory or either the obligatory and recommended actions...”<sup>4</sup>

So in all cases whether it be the word (الأعمال) or ((العمل)) then it still incorrect and erroneous, so I hope this is understood oh Amjad!

Amjad Rafeeq wrote:

**The Second: The blatant lie that the brother (i.e. Abu Fujoor) who explained the definition was incorrect did so because "It is general" (لأنه مجمل). This is outright falsification.**

**Firstly:** How do you certify who is who in the question then build accusations upon it whilst no names were mentioned therein?

**Secondly:** Amjad affirms in his writings that the scholars who I mentioned in my clarification criticized Ibn Hajar for his generalization.

---

<sup>2</sup> Reference: Sharhut- Tahaawee 1/593.

<sup>3</sup> To the end of the quote.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/...afeeq&eman.pdf>



For example Amjad said regarding al-Shibal:

**‘...he sees a problem with this generalization of Ibn Hajar...’**

Whilst here Amjad is claiming it to be a lie, alleging that I did not clarify that whilst at the same time Amjad admits that I mentioned in my clarification the criticisms of the scholars regarding Ibn Hajar’s generalization.

This is another clear contradiction from Amjad Rafeeq!

Ash-Shaykh Muqbil, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“The people of hizbiyyah terribly contradict themselves...”<sup>5</sup>

Also ash-Shaykh Abdul Muhsin, al-Abaad, may Allah preserve him, said:

“Verily contradiction in reality is from the signs of the people of innovations and desires...”<sup>6</sup>

In the book "Hashdul Kataa'ib wal Asaatee," by ash-Shaykh Abu Bakr Maahir bin A'teeyah al-Misree,<sup>7</sup> quoted on Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy upon him, where he said:

"For verily one contradicting one-self is from the first stages of corruption"

Then ash-Shaykh Abu Bakr Maahir, may Allah preserve him, commented on this statement by saying:

"And know may Allah have mercy upon me and you that falsehood is contradictive and in differing contrary to the truth for verily there is no contradiction or differing therein."<sup>8</sup>

**Thirdly:** From what I criticized Amjad for, was deceiving the readers to believe that the error of Ibn Hajar was merely a generalization, as I clearly made apparent in my refutations for example my statement:

---

<sup>5</sup> Reference: Gaarutu al-Ashritah (2/106).

<sup>6</sup> Ref: al-Intisaar for Ahlis Sunnah and Hadeeth" (124).

<sup>7</sup> One of the senior students of ash-Shaykh Muqbil, who is currently in Egypt,

<sup>8</sup> Page 62, print: Daarul Imaam al-Muhammadi, published in the year: 2005.



‘So it becomes more and more clear that the issue is not just merely erroneous generalization but rather what it is built upon this, is that Ibn Hajar does not see actions necessary for eeman however he sees it to be from eeman from the angle that it completes eeman.’<sup>9</sup>

Amjad Rafeeq wrote:

‘...Also note the part that Abu Fujoor added from himself in his translation of the question, (the speech can be taken into many different ways) - by Allaah what deception...’

And he also wrote:

“...It is general [لأنه مجمل] (the speech can be taken into many different ways) [note: the explanation in brackets (the speech can be taken into many different ways) is not in the question, it is an explanatory addition by Abu Fujoor]...”

As the saying goes: ثبت عرشك ثم انقش

Which basically means: *affirm your foundation before building on it.*

Please get your facts straight before making such blatant accusations.

Firstly: I did not translate the question nor did I ask the question which you already knew however you are only merely pretending not to know.

Secondly: Here Amjad is trying to mislead the readers that the word (مجل) does not mean (the speech can be taken into many different ways) whereas he claims this sentence was only added to the question as an explanation from my own understanding not from the word (مجل).

The Scholar al-Kafawee defined the word (المجل) as basically meaning a speech in which can be taken into many different ways.<sup>10</sup>

So if Amjad see that word (مجل) does not mean (the speech can be taken into many different ways) then please prove to me otherwise:

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/feebleresponsetoamjad.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> The dictionary 'al-Kuliyyaat', page (35), print: al-Mu'asas ar-Risaalah



نَبِّئُونِي بِعِلْمٍ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ ﴿١٤٣﴾

*Allah, The Most High, said:*

*"Inform me with knowledge if you are truthful."*

Amjad wrote:

‘Notice that the answer of Shaykh al-Barraak is incomplete, it cuts off abruptly at the part where the issue of speech (qawl) is being discussed. That's not the full answer, there must be more. Allaah knows best why it has been clipped at that point...’

First of all: I advise you to remain silent from speaking regarding these matters; you are only embarrassing yourself by speaking of what you have no knowledge of.

Secondly: I will post here the whole audio, so the readers can witness for themselves that the rest of the audio was not included because the Shaykh was merely asking the questioner personal questions such if he was married or not and so forth then he advised him not to busy himself in that matter and that actions are from eeman and there is no need for arguments over it rather just clarify the truth in the matter and to stick to the well-known scholars.

Click here to listen to the audio:

[www.dawahfromyemen.info/audio/shbarrakaudio.mp3](http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/audio/shbarrakaudio.mp3)

Amjad wrote:

‘...It is better to quote the original Arabic of the response from the audio, because Abu Fujoor's translation contains inaccuracies and omissions (this established kadhdhaab and dishonest, unreliable individual should not be translating anything at all)...’

The Messenger of Allah, alayhi as-salaatu was-salaam said:



إياكم والظن فإن الظن أكذب الحديث

‘Beware of assumptions/suspicion for verily assumptions are the falsest of speech’<sup>11</sup>

Here again Amjad makes false accusations based upon assumptions and suspicion, Since I did not translate the audio nor did I ascribe the translation of the audio to myself , this is merely an accusation built upon false assumptions which will not be of any benefit to him on the day of Judgment.

Ash-Shaykh Ibn Baaz, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“...Verily if a person becomes accustomed to falsehood then it becomes difficult for him to distance himself from it and (also) he begins to hunt for doubts to justify his actions and comes to be attached to spider webs”<sup>12</sup>

Amjad wrote:

**‘...So going to al-Shibal and posing this question to him (and his answer) does not solve any problems in reality...’**

Amjad strives to deceive to the public that he was only saying what al-Shibal and the scholars stated about the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar.

So let’s compare the scholar’s statements to Amjad Rafeeq’s statements:

- 1: Saalih al-Aali-Shaykh mentioned that this comment of (which contains the quote of Ibn Hajar) is mostly built upon the understanding of the deviant sect al-Maaturidiyyah.
- 2: Shaykh Saalih al-Aali-Shaykh considered the whole comment of who quoted the statement of Ibn Hajar to be wrong.
- 3: Shaykh Ibn Baaz mentioned that it is the statement of the Murji’ah.
- 4: Muhammad Ishaaq al-Kandu mentioned that it has not been reported upon any one from the Salaf who said that actions were a condition of the completeness of eeman.

---

<sup>11</sup> Saheeh al-Adabul Mufrad (972). Al-Albaani declared the hadeeth Saheeh

<sup>12</sup> Ref: Explanation of Kashfu Shubuhaats (130), print: al-Andalus.



5: al-Baraak and others considered it be a (مخالفة في العقيدة) which means a mistake/violation in aqeedah.

So let's compare the aforementioned criticisms of the scholars to the statement of Amjad Rafeeq:

**'...And that despite this, the ambiguity and generalization in the use of such terms can be objected, because this can be considered an error in expression, even if the underlying meaning and intent is actually correct and that its best that they are avoided...'**

So it is merely a matter of only being considered to be an error in expression and a matter which is only best to avoid to Amjad's point of view.

Despite the fact that Amjad did not avoid to mention it in his publication which he propagated.

We ask Allah to guide Amjad or else continue to expose him.

**Also Amjad continues to bring irrelevant speech to the topic of debate:**

For example Amjad Rafeeq brings a general speech of Shaykh Muhammad bin AbdulWahaab al-Aqeel to justify that we are causing fitnah and discord for criticizing him for propagating the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar, Whereas in reality Shaykh Muhammad Abdul Wahaab is from those who are in agreement of the critique which were written in criticizing the aqeedah errors of Ibn Hajar of the book Fat-hul Baari and he is not against those scholars who criticized Ibn Hajar for that. So now how can the general speech of his be used against those who criticized Amjad for propagating the aqeedah errors of Ibn Hajar!

From those who al-Shibal mentioned in his preface of his book that were a big help in his critique of Ibn Hajar's errors in 'aqeedah were:

Ash-Shaykh al-Uthaymeen. Shaykh AbdulAzeez ar-Raajihi, ash-Shaykh Abdul Azeez al-Aali-Shaykh (the current Muftee), ash-Shaykh Abdullah bin Abdul Azeez al-Aqeel and others.

Ash-Shaykh Muqbil, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:



“...This is a good matter that al-Haafidh (i.e. Ibn Hajar) is criticized for what he was mistaken in, for verily he was criticized for his mistakes pertaining to al-Aqeedah...”<sup>13</sup>

Also, he, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“...So an-Nawawee has been affected by al-Maaziree (one of the Ash’aris) and likewise al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar whereas they were affected by their society, therefore the society has a (strong) influence, thus if you were to read ‘Fat-hul Baari’ you should beware/warn (unclear in original text) from the likes of these slips/errors...”<sup>14</sup>

Ash-Shaykh Rabee’, may Allah preserve him, said:

“And it is from the methodology of the Salaf that they keep far from words which are mujmal and unclear, keeping far from those wordings which have not been mentioned in the book and Sunnah and due to what it causes of fitnah between the Muslims rather the Salaf have declared who he treads this path to be an innovator, as Shaykh Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy upon, reported. Also al-Allaamah al-Uthaymeen, criticized the usage of the words (genus actions) or are the actions of a condition of correctness or a condition of completeness of eeman and he said ‘This buzz has no good within it’ or as he said.”<sup>15</sup>

And as for Amjad brining mentioning of Ash-Shaykh Albani then we say as Ash-Shaykh Rabee, may Allah preserve him, said when he was asked the following question:

**Question:** Is the statement of Albani that actions are a condition of completeness and not a condition of correctness make him from the Murji’ah?

**He answered:** We cannot say that he is a Murji’ because of this speech. This speech from the Shaikh is criticized and we do not accept it. We say that actions are a part of Imaan, not a condition in it, and this what Al Haafidh Ibn Hajar said and other than him and I hope that the Shaykh returns from this (speech) and that the issue is clarified to him...”<sup>16</sup>

**Lastly:** oh Amjad I end this advice by requesting from you to back-off from writing refutations on the internet up until you firmly study under a scholar, these refutations of yours are clearly filled with false accusations and severe name calling and vulgar and foul

---

<sup>13</sup> Ref: Gaaratul Ashritah (100), print al-Athariyyah.

<sup>14</sup> Ref : ( 180) of the same source.

<sup>15</sup> Ref: Library of Ash-Shaykh Rabee’ provided by the program ‘Shamela’.

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.salafi-poetry.net/vb/showthread.php?t=2171>



language which clearly shows you do not possess the etiquettes of a student of Knowledge.

Also the scholars have mentioned that the weapon of the ignoramus in debate is to overcome is opponent by name-calling and insults which clearly is noticeable in Amjad's writings.

So my advice to you is as a poet once said:

فدع عنك الكتابة فلست منها ولو سَوَدَّتْ وجهك بالمداد

*Leave off writing you are not for it and even if you were to fill your  
whole face with ink*

Written by AbuFajr AbdulFattaah bin U'thmaan as-Somaalee